

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| SHARIEFF JONES, | : | |
| Petitioner, | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | Civ. No. 16-949 |
| | : | |
| THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR THE | : | |
| CITY OF PHILADELPHIA <i>et al.</i>, | : | |
| Respondents. | : | |
| | : | |

O R D E R

United States Magistrate Judge Henry S. Perkin issued a Report and Recommendation advising that I deny Sharieff Jones's *habeas* Petition. Jones has not objected to Judge Perkin's R&R. After carefully reviewing Judge Perkin's thorough opinion, I conclude that his analysis is plainly correct. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note to the 1983 amendment ("When no timely objection is filed, [I] need only satisfy [myself] that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation."); see also Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987).

AND NOW, this 17th day of July, 2020, upon consideration of the Petition for a Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1), Respondents' Opposition (Doc. No. 29), and the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 33), which correctly conc to which no objection has been filed, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
2. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DENIED** with prejudice;
3. I will not conduct an evidentiary hearing because the record conclusively shows that Jones is not entitled to relief. See United States v. Lilly, 536 F.3d 190, 196 (3d Cir. 2008);

4. There are no grounds to issue a certificate of appealability; and
5. The Clerk of Court shall **CLOSE** this case.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Paul S. Diamond

Paul S. Diamond, J.